

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

to help him. I should like to hear some affirmative argument on the bill before we move to any unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question, because I find myself in agreement with him. I wonder if the Senator shares my view that we need a great deal of education on the bill, and that two of the best forums available for education will be the upcoming political conventions. Does not the Senator from Illinois believe that a vote on the bill could well go over until August, after the party conventions have met and we are able to see what position the party conventions take, and what arguments they make on the bill? Then we can come back and for once do something about keeping the promises the parties have made in their platforms?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. MORSE. Therefore, I wish to say I am not at least moved by any desire for speed on the bill. I think we need time—a great deal of it—and I urge that we take the time.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only wish to say that after the long parade of testimony and witnesses and arguments we had in the Committee on Finance, if we carry the matter to the Democratic convention, we will probably not get to the nominations until 3 weeks after it opens.

Mr. MORSE. That would not be a bad idea, either.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. May I be recognized again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may be recognized on another subject.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the amendment offered in the previous Congress by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. He rose to speak when H.R. 10 was before the Senate. Two years ago he offered an amendment to reach toward tax uniformity. He said if H.R. 10 were to pass, the principle should apply to railroad labor, social security, to those on the Government retirement rolls, and to those in privately contributed pension plans.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not yield for that purpose. I recall that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia inquired about the cost, and he was informed that the cost of making this principle applicable to everyone would be \$3 billion. The Senator from Virginia said, "I am in favor of tax uniformity, but I am not in favor of losing \$3 billion."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the Senator from Louisiana is not discussing morning business.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, has the Senate agreed to a rule of germaneness?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule is for the consideration of morning business; and this debate has not concerned itself with morning business.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have stood here and heard other Senators make speeches lasting 15 or 20 minutes, and I have never objected. Yet the first time I want to take more than 3 minutes, some Senator raises the issue with me.

If the Senate wishes to proceed in that way, all right. We can have a quorum call at the end of the morning hour, get a nice crowd of Senators here, take our happy time, and get ready to hear another speaker.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may talk for another minute.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana may proceed for 3 minutes, and that then the morning business be concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, a moment ago, when I asked that I be recognized in the morning hour twice on the same subject, the Chair told me that it was impossible for me so to do. Now I find the able Senator from Louisiana being recognized for a second time to speak on the same subject. I am sure he would not want to deprive me of the same privilege he has.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not object to the request of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MORSE) stood on the floor 2 years ago when a majority of the Senate was pledged to a bill similar to H.R. 10. He offered an amendment which sought to reach toward tax uniformity. His amendment would have cost the Treasury \$3 billion in revenue because it sought to have civil service employees treated the same as doctors and lawyers.

The Senator from Oregon was informed by the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD) that the Senator could not accept such an amendment; that while he favored tax uniformity, he was opposed to having the Treasury lose \$3 billion.

The Senator from Oregon said that tax uniformity could not be sacrificed for money, so he said, "It is my amendment or nothing." That is exactly what it was—nothing.

I tell Senators who have agreed to vote for H.R. 10 that unless they agree to modify the bill in the direction of tax uniformity, the situation will be the same as when the Senator from Oregon made his prediction 2 years ago: "It will be this amendment or nothing."

Mr. MORSE. I will help the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS TAX RETIREMENT ACT OF 1980

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is that the unfinished business he laid before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG).

The senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. WILEY) is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield, without losing his right to the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, when I became a Member of the Senate, one of its Members was a very distinguished Senator from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg. When he had a message to deliver, he would ask unanimous consent that he not be interrupted until he had concluded his address. I now make such a request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate, so that the request of the Senator from Wisconsin may be understood by all Senators? I understand the Senator's request is that he not be interrupted during his speech.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct. I once asked Senator Vandenberg why he made such a request. He said, "If you were in the gallery and saw the performance as it went on, with interruption after interruption, you would understand why there is difficulty in maintaining continuity of thinking. It is impossible to shed light on the subject which is under discussion. So I have found it advisable to make the request that I not be interrupted."

I thought that was the remark of a wise man; and, as we all know, Senator Vandenberg became one of the great statesmen of our Nation.

On Tuesday, June 28, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), submitted to the Sen-